A Robust Generalized Chinese Remainder Theorem for Two Integers

Xiaoping Li, Xiang-Gen Xia, *Fellow, IEEE*, Wenjie Wang, *Member, IEEE*, Wei Wang

arXiv:1510.03277v1 [cs.IT] 9 Oct 2015

Abstract

A generalized Chinese remainder theorem (CRT) for multiple integers from residue sets has been studied recently, where the correspondence between the remainders and the integers in each residue set modulo several moduli is not known. A robust CRT has also been proposed lately for robustly reconstruct a single integer from its erroneous remainders. In this paper, we consider the reconstruction problem of two integers from their residue sets, where the remainders are not only out of order but also may have errors. We prove that two integers can be robustly reconstructed if their remainder errors are less than $M/8$, where M is the greatest common divisor (gcd) of all the moduli. We also propose an efficient reconstruction algorithm. Finally, we present some simulations to verify the efficiency of the proposed algorithm. The study is motivated and has applications in the determination of multiple frequencies from multiple undersampled waveforms.

Index Terms

Chinese remainder theorem (CRT), robust CRT, dynamic range, residue sets, remainder errors, frequency determination from undersampled waveforms

This work was partially supported by the NSFC (Nos. 61172092, 61302069), the Research Fund for the Doctoral Programs of Higher Education of China (No. 20130201110014), and the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR) under Grant FA9550-12-1-0055. This work was done when Xiaoping Li was visiting the University of Delaware.

Xiaoping Li and Wenjie Wang are with MOE Key Lab for Intelligent Networks and Network Security, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, Shaanxi 710049 P. R. China (e-mail: lixiaoping@stu.xjtu.edu.cn; wjwang@xjtu.edu.cn).

Xiang-Gen Xia is with Xidian University, Xi'an, China, and the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716, USA. (e-mail: xxia@ee.udel.edu).

Wei Wang is with College of Information Engineering, Tarim University, Alar, Xinjiang 843300 P. R. China (e-mail: wangwei.math@gmail.com).

I. INTRODUCTION

The tranditional Chinese remainder theorem (CRT) is to reconstruct a single nonnegative integer from its remainders modulo several smaller positive integers (called moduli) and it has tremendous applications in various areas [1]-[4]. There are various generalizations of CRT, see, for example, [5] for some of them. One of the generalizations, generalized CRT, is to determine multiple integers from their residue sets where each residue set is the set of remainders of the multiple integers modulo a modulus and the correspondence between the remainders and the multiple integers is not known, i.e., each residue set is not ordered. This problem was first studied in [6]. It was later studied independently in [7]-[13], motivated from multiple frequency determination in multiple undersampled waveforms. It exists in many engineering applications, such as phase unwrapping in signal processing [14]-[18], multiwavelength optical interferometry [19], [20], radar signal processing [21]-[25], mechanical engineering [26], and wireless sensor networks [27], [28].

Usually the moduli in CRT or the generalized CRT mentioned above are required to be pairwise co-prime, which is not robust in the sense that a small error in its remainders may cause a large reconstruction error. Robust reconstruction methods, i.e., robust CRT, for a single integer from its erroneous remainders have been studied and obtained in [29]-[39]. The basic idea for these robust CRT is to include a common factor among all the moduli and then as long as the remainder errors are less than the quarter of the greatest common factor (gcd) of all the moduli, a reconstruction error of the integer will be less than the maximum remainder error. Several robust reconstruction methods have been proposed, for example, searching based robust CRT [31]-[33], closed-form robust CRT [34], [35], multi-stage robust CRT [37], [38], where in [38] the upper bound of the quarter of the gcd has been improved when the remaining integers factorized by the gcd of all the moduli are not necessarily co-prime. All these studies are only for the traditional CRT for single integers. There is no attempt in the literature to robustly reconstruct multiple integers from their erroneous residue sets, i.e., robust generalized CRT, although [12] studies the case when most of the residue sets are error free but only a few remainder sets include erroneous remainders and is not in the sense of the robustness in the literature. The main goal of this paper is on a robust generalized CRT for two integers.

For the case of more than one integer estimation from their residue sets, i.e., the generalized CRT, the reconstruction is more complicated. As mentioned in [8], the main difficulty for the case of no less than two integers comes from the fact that the correspondence between the original integer and its remainder is not known, which happens when the remainders are obtained by detecting the peaks of the discrete

Fourier transforms (DFT) of an undersampled waveform as described in [8]. Moreover, the number of the remainders in a residue set may be less than the number of the integers to determine, since there may be two or more integers sharing the same remainder for some moduli. While all the distinct elements in a residue set are known, the number of repetitions of any remainder is not known in general unless there are only two integers to determine. As mentioned earlier, for the robustness of reconstructing a single integer from its erroneous remainders, it is critical to have a gcd larger than 1 among all the moduli. This has to hold for the above generalized CRT for multiple integers. However, the generalized CRT methods studied before are only when all the moduli are pairwise co-prime. Therefore, in order to study a robust generalized CRT, we first need to study the generalized CRT when all the moduli have a gcd larger than 1 and all the remainders are error free. A basic problem then is to determine the dynamic range for a given set of moduli, i.e., the largest range within which multiple nonnegative integers can be uniquely determined from their residue sets modulo the given moduli. For this problem and when all the moduli are pairwise co-prime, several lower bounds for the dynamic range were obtained in [7]-[10]. A most recent tight bound was obtained in [13] for two integers where a closed-form and a simple determination algorithm were also obtained.

In this paper, we first present the largest dynamic range for two integers when all the moduli have a gcd larger than 1 and the remaining integers factorized by the gcd of the moduli are pairwise co-prime. For the generalized CRT with erroneous remainders, we obtain a remainder error bound of the eighth of the gcd of all the moduli that leads to a robust estimation of two integers. An efficient reconstruction algorithm is also presented when two integers are within the largest dynamic range. Note that, for the robustness, the remainder error bound, the eighth of the gcd for two integers, seems not surprising, when the remainder error bound, the quarter of the gcd, for a single integer in CRT is known. However, as we shall see later, the proof is not trivial at all.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we briefly describe the mathematical problem and introduce some notations. In Section III, we present the largest dynamic range and a closed-form determination algorithm for two integers from their error free residue sets, where the moduli are no longer pairwise co-prime. In Section IV, we present a robust generalized CRT for two integers. In Section V, we present an application of the proposed robust generalized CRT in frequency estimation from multiple undersampled waveforms. In Section VI, we conclude this paper.

II. Problem Description

We begin with the multiple frequency determination problem from multiple undersampled waveforms [8]. For simplicity, a complex-valued waveform is given as

$$x(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{L} A_l e^{2\pi j f_l t} + w(t), \tag{1}$$

where $w(t)$ is the additive noise, A_l and f_l are nonzero coefficients and frequencies, respectively. Suppose that these frequencies are distinct non-negative integers, i.e., $f_l = N_l$, where $N_l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{N}$ denotes the set of natural numbers, $N_i \neq N_j$ for $i \neq j$, in Hz. Let $K \geq 2$ and $m_1, \ldots, m_K$ be K positive integers with $1 < m_1 < \cdots < m_K$. For each $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$, the sampled signal with sampling frequency m_k Hz is

$$x_{m_k}[n] = x\left(\frac{n}{m_k}\right) = \sum_{l=1}^{L} A_l e^{2\pi j N_l n/m_k} + w\left(\frac{n}{m_k}\right), \ n \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbb{Z}$ denotes the set of integers. Then, we take the m_k-point DFT to $x_{m_k}[n]$ in (2), and obtain

$$\text{DFT}_{m_k}\big(x_{m_k}[n]\big)[r] = \sum_{l=1}^{L} A_l \delta(r - r_{l,k}) + W[r]. \tag{3}$$

Without considering the influence of noise, remainders $r_{l,k} \equiv N_l \mod m_k$ can be detected from the m_k-point DFT without the order information. Then, we have the K error-free residue sets

$$R_k\left(N_1, \ldots, N_L\right) = \bigcup_{l=1}^{L} \{r_{l,k}\}, \ k = 1, \ldots, K \tag{4}$$

from the K DFTs. In practice, signals are usually corrupted by noises and thus the obtained remainders $r_{l,k}$ may have errors. Let the erroneous remainders be $\tilde{r}_{l,k}$:

$$\tilde{r}_{l,k} = r_{l,k} + \Delta r_{l,k}, \ l = 1, \ldots, L; \ k = 1, \ldots, K, \tag{5}$$

where $\Delta r_{l,k}$ denote the errors. Then, the erroneous residue sets are

$$\tilde{R}_k\left(N_1, \ldots, N_L\right) = \bigcup_{l=1}^{L} \{\tilde{r}_{l,k}\}, \ k = 1, \ldots, K. \tag{6}$$

The problem is to determine the L frequencies $\{N_1, \ldots, N_L\}$ from these erroneous residue sets.

Under the condition of all the remainders are error-free, $L = 2$, and all the K moduli $m_1, \ldots, m_K$ are pairwise co-prime, in [13] we obtained the largest dynamic range within which two frequencies (integers), $\{N_1, N_2\}$, can be uniquely determined from their residue sets $R_k(N_1, N_2)$, where an efficient reconstruction algorithm was also proposed. In this paper, we first generalize the largest dynamic range result obtained in [13] from pairwise co-prime moduli $\mathcal{M}' = \{m_1, \ldots, m_K\}$ to non-pairwise co-prime

moduli $\mathcal{M} = \{M_1, \ldots, M_K\}$ with $M_k = Mm_k$ for $k = 1, \ldots, K$, where $0 < m_1 < \cdots < m_K$ are pairwise co-prime moduli and M is a positive integer. We then study the reconstruction problem of two integers from the erroneous residue sets $\tilde{R}_1(N_1, N_2), \ldots, \tilde{R}_K(N_1, N_2)$ modulo M_k for $k = 1, \ldots, K$. This question has two parts: 1) the bound of errors, i.e., to what extent of errors we can have a robust estimation of $\{N_1, N_2\}$? 2) how to efficiently and robustly reconstruct $\{N_1, N_2\}$? In what follows, we always denote $\mathcal{M}' = \{m_1, \ldots, m_K\}$ a set of moduli, $\Gamma = \prod_{k=1}^{K} m_k$, and $\mathcal{M} = \{M_1, \ldots, M_K\}$ a set of moduli.

III. Generalized CRT For Two Integers With Error-free Residue Sets

In this section, we first recall the basics of dynamic range with modulus set $\mathcal{M}'$ obtained in [13]. Then we obtain the largest dynamic range with a modulus set $\mathcal{M}$ and an efficient method to determine two integers from error-free residue sets.

We first introduce some notations. The remainder of x modulo y is denoted as $\langle x \rangle_y$. For integer $n > 0$, let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ denote the set $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$. A set of n elements is called an n-set. If we let $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_L\}$ with $a_l \in \mathbb{N}$, $l = 1, \ldots, L$, $R_k(a_1, \ldots, a_L)$ is also denoted by $R_k(\mathcal{A})$.

Definition 1: The dynamic range of a modulus set $\mathcal{N} = \{n_1, \ldots, n_K\}$ is the minimal positive integer D such that there are two different L-sets $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ with $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{D+1}$ satisfying $R_k(\mathcal{A}) = R_k(\mathcal{B})$ for each modulus n_k. It is denoted by $D_L(n_1, \ldots, n_K)$, or simply $D_L(\mathcal{N})$.

According to Definition 1, if any set of L integers in $\mathbb{Z}_{D'}$ can be uniquely determined by their remainders modulo $n_1, \ldots, n_K$, then we have $D_L(\mathcal{N}) \geq D'$. On the other hand, if L integers are in $\mathbb{Z}_{D_L(\mathcal{N})}$, then they can be uniquely determined from their remainders modulo $n_1, \ldots, n_K$. Hence, the dynamic range $D_L(\mathcal{N})$ in Definition 1 is the largest dynamic range within which any L integers are uniquely determined by their remainders modulo $n_1, \ldots, n_K$. For $L = 2$ and a given modulus set $\mathcal{M}'$, the largest dynamic range $D_2(\mathcal{M}')$ is obtained in [13] as follows.

Lemma 1: [13] If $m_{K-1} \geq 3$, then $D_2(\mathcal{M}') = d$. In other words, if $\mathcal{M}' \neq \{2, 2n+1\}$ for any positive integer n, then

$$D_2(\mathcal{M}') = d, \tag{7}$$

where

$$d = \min_{I \subseteq \{1, \ldots, K\}} \left\{ \prod_{i \in I} m_i + \prod_{i \in \overline{I}} m_i \right\}. \tag{8}$$

As an example, we consider the case of $m_1 = 3$, $m_2 = 5$, and $m_3 = 7$. According to Lemma 1, we know that the largest dynamic is $d = 3 \times 5 + 7 = 22$. Next, we determine the largest dynamic range with modulus set $\mathcal{M}$ for two integers, i.e., $D_2(\mathcal{M})$.

A. The Largest Dynamic Range for Two Integers with Modulus Set $\mathcal{M}$

Theorem 1: If $m_1 \geq 3$ and $K > 2$, then $D_2(\mathcal{M}) = Md$.

Proof: According to the definition of d in (8), we have

$$d \leq m_1 + \prod_{k=2}^{K} m_k < m_1 \cdots m_K.$$

Hence, there must exist a non-empty set $I \subseteq \{1, \ldots, K\}$ such that

$$d = \prod_{k \in I} m_k + \prod_{k \in \overline{I}} m_k. \tag{9}$$

We denote the two terms in the summation (9) by d_1 and d_2:

$$d_1 = \prod_{k \in I} m_k, \;\; d_2 = \prod_{k \in \overline{I}} m_k.$$

Construct two 2-sets $\mathcal{A}_0$ and $\mathcal{B}_0$ as:

$$\mathcal{A}_0 = \{0, Md\}, \;\; \mathcal{B}_0 = \{Md_1, Md_2\}.$$

It is not difficult to find that $R_k(\mathcal{A}_0) = R_k(\mathcal{B}_0)$ holds with moduli $M_1, \ldots, M_K$. According to Definition 1, we obtain

$$D_2(\mathcal{M}) \leq Md. \tag{10}$$

Next, we prove that $D_2(\mathcal{M}) \geq Md$.

By Definition 1, $D_2(\mathcal{M})$ is the minimal positive integer such that there are two different 2-sets $\mathcal{A} = \{N_1', N_2'\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{D_2(\mathcal{M})+1}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{N_1, N_2\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{D_2(\mathcal{M})+1}$ with $R_k(\mathcal{A}) = R_k(\mathcal{B})$, $k = 1, \ldots, K$. Without loss of generality, we assume $N_1' < N_2'$, $N_1 < N_2$, and $N_1' \leq N_1$. Clearly,

$$\min\{\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}\} = N_1'.$$

By Lemma 1 in [13], we have

$$N_1' = 0.$$

Then we have two cases below.

Case 1: $N_1 + N_2 \leq M\Gamma$.

Since $N_1' = 0$ and $R_k(\mathcal{A}) = R_k(\mathcal{B})$ for $k = 1, \ldots, K$, we have $0 \in R_k(\mathcal{B})$. Hence, M_k divides N_1 or N_2, i.e.,

$$M_k | N_1 \text{ or } M_k | N_2, \ k = 1, \ldots, K.$$

Define $I = \{k \colon M_k | N_1\}$ and $J = \{k \colon M_k | N_2\}$. Then we have

$$I \cup J = \{1, \ldots, K\},$$

which means $\overline{I} \subseteq J$. Hence,

$$N_1 \geq M \prod_{i \in I} m_i, \ N_2 \geq M \prod_{i \in J} m_i.$$

Therefore,

$$N_1 + N_2 \geq M \prod_{i \in I} m_i + M \prod_{i \in J} m_i \geq M \prod_{i \in I} m_i + M \prod_{i \in \overline{I}} m_i \geq Md.$$

Note that $\mathcal{A} = \{N_1', N_2'\}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{N_1, N_2\}$ have the same residue sets, for each modulus M_k, we have

$$N_1' + N_2' \equiv N_1 + N_2 \bmod M_k.$$

Hence,

$$N_2' \equiv N_1 + N_2 \bmod M_k.$$

That is,

$$N_2' = N_1 + N_2 + kM\Gamma \text{ for some integer } k.$$

If $k \leq -1$, then we obtain from $N_1 + N_2 \leq M\Gamma$ that $N_2' \leq 0$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $k \geq 0$, and hence

$$N_2' \geq N_1 + N_2.$$

It follows from (**??**) that $N_2' \geq Md$, which leads to

$$D_2(\mathcal{M}) \geq N_2' \geq Md.$$

Case 2: $N_1 + N_2 \geq M\Gamma + 1$.

Since $N_2 > N_1$, we obtain

$$2N_2 \geq N_1 + 1 + N_2 \geq M\Gamma + 2.$$

Note that $D_2(\mathcal{M}) \geq N_2$. Then we have

$$D_2(\mathcal{M}) \geq \left\lceil \frac{1}{2} M\Gamma \right\rceil + 1.$$

Since $m_1 \geq 3$ and $K > 2$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2}M\Gamma \quad \geq \tfrac{1}{2}Mm_2 \cdots m_K + Mm_2 \cdots m_K \geq Mm_1 + Mm_2 \cdots m_K \geq Md.$$

Thus,

$$D_2(\mathcal{M}) \geq \min\left\{Md, \left\lceil \frac{1}{2}M\Gamma \right\rceil + 1\right\} = Md. \tag{11}$$

Combining (10) and (11), we obtain

$$D_2(\mathcal{M}) = Md.$$

■

B. A Generalized CRT for Two Integers with Modulus Set $\mathcal{M}$

We begin with the reconstruction of one integer N with modulus set $\mathcal{M}$. Let N be an integer to be reconstructed, and r_k be the remainders of N modulo M_k, i.e.,

$$r_k \equiv N \bmod M_k, \ k = 1, \ldots, K, \tag{12}$$

where $0 \leq r_k < M_k$. From (12), we have

$$r_k \equiv N \bmod M, \ k = 1, \ldots, K. \tag{13}$$

That is, all remainders r_k modulo M have the same value, named common remainder [40], denoted as r^c. It follows from (12) that both $r_k - r^c$ and $N - r^c$ have the same factor M. Let

$$Q = (N - r^c)/M \tag{14}$$

and

$$q_k = (r_k - r^c)/M. \tag{15}$$

Then, congruence (12) is equivalent to

$$q_k \equiv Q \bmod m_k, \quad k = 1, \ldots, K.$$

According to the traditional CRT, Q can be uniquely reconstructed as

$$Q \equiv \sum_{k=1}^{K} \Gamma_k \overline{\Gamma}_k q_k \bmod \Gamma, \tag{16}$$

if and only if $Q < \Gamma$, where $\Gamma_k = \Gamma/m_k$, and $\overline{\Gamma}_k$ is the multiplicative inverse of Γ_k modulo m_k, i.e.,

$$\Gamma_k \overline{\Gamma}_k \equiv 1 \bmod m_k.$$

Therefore, N can be uniquely reconstructed by

$$N = MQ + r^c. \tag{17}$$

Now, we consider the reconstruction of two integers $\{N_1, N_2\}$ from their error-free residue sets $R_k(N_1, N_2)$ with modulus set $\mathcal{M}$. Similar to the reconstruction of one integer, the common remainders are significant to the reconstruction. First, from the residue sets, obtain the two common remainders modulo all the remainders by M.

Let $\{r_1^c, r_2^c\}$ be the two common remainders. When the two common remainders are not equal, i.e., $r_1^c \neq r_2^c$, we have $R_k(N_1, N_2) = \{r_{1,k}, r_{2,k}\}$ with $r_{1,k} \neq r_{2,k}$. Note that

$$\{r_1^c, r_2^c\} = \left\{\langle r_{1,k}\rangle_M, \langle r_{2,k}\rangle_M\right\}$$

holds for each k, $k = 1, \ldots, K$. On the other hand,

$$\{r_1^c, r_2^c\} = \left\{\langle N_1\rangle_M, \langle N_2\rangle_M\right\}.$$

Hence, all the remainders in $R_k(N_1, N_2)$ can be split into two sets, $\{r_{1,1}, \ldots, r_{1,K}\}$ and $\{r_{2,1}, \ldots, r_{2,K}\}$, according to r_1^c and r_2^c. Using the traditional CRT, N_1 and N_2 can be uniquely determined by their remainders $\{r_{1,1}, \ldots, r_{1,K}\}$ and $\{r_{2,1}, \ldots, r_{2,K}\}$, respectively. This also means that $\{N_1, N_2\}$ can be uniquely determined if and only if $0 \leq N_1, N_2 < M\Gamma$.

When the two common remainders are the same, i.e., $r_1^c = r_2^c = r^c$, we let $q_{l,k} = (r_{l,k} - r^c)/M,\ l = 1, 2;\ k = 1, \ldots, K$. Then, (12) is equivalent to

$$q_{l,k} \equiv \frac{N_l - r^c}{M} \bmod m_k. \tag{18}$$

Denote $R_k(Q_1, Q_2) = \{q_{1,k}, q_{2,k}\}$ for $k = 1, \ldots, K$, where $Q_l = (N_l - r^c)/M$ for $l = 1, 2$. Since $N_l < Md$, we have $Q_l < d$. By the definition of dynamic range, we know that $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$ can be uniquely determined by their residue sets $R_k(Q_1, Q_2)$. Consequently, $\{N_1, N_2\}$ can be uniquely reconstructed by using formula (17).

In summary, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1: Assume that $m_1 \geq 3$ and $K > 2$. Let $\{r_1^c, r_2^c\}$ be the common remainders defined as above. We have the following results.

1) If $r_1^c \neq r_2^c$ and $0 \leq N_1, N_2 < M\Gamma$, then $\{N_1, N_2\}$ can be uniquely determined from the above algorithm;

2) If $r_1^c = r_2^c$ and $0 \leq N_1, N_2 < Md$, then $\{N_1, N_2\}$ can be uniquely determined from the above algorithm.

Example 1. Let $M = 100$ and moduli be $m_1 = 3$, $m_2 = 5$, and $m_3 = 7$. By Theorem 1, we obtain that the largest dynamic range is $Md = 2200$. Hence, two integers $\{N_1, N_2\}$ less than 2200 can be uniquely determined from their residue sets $R_k(N_1, N_2)$. Suppose that the residue sets are $R_1(N_1, N_2) = \{69, 195\}$, $R_2(N_1, N_2) = \{95, 169\}$, and $R_3(N_1, N_2) = \{69, 395\}$. Then, the two common remainders are $\{r_1^c, r_2^c\} = \{69, 95\}$. Hence, the remainder in the residue sequences can be split into $\{69, 169, 69\}$ and $\{195, 95, 395\}$ corresponding to $r_1^c = 69$ and $r_2^c = 95$, respectively. By using the traditional CRT, we have $\{N_1, N_2\} = \{2169, 1095\}$.

Example 2. Consider the example above. Suppose that the residue sets are $R_1(N_1, N_2) = \{98, 198\}$, $R_2(N_1, N_2) = \{98, 398\}$, and $R_3(N_1, N_2) = \{398, 498\}$ modulo 300, 500, and 700, respectively. In this case, the two common remainders are the same: $r_1^c = r_2^c = 98$. By (15), we have $R_1(Q_1, Q_2) = \{0, 1\}$, $R_2(Q_1, Q_2) = \{0, 3\}$, and $R_3(Q_1, Q_2) = \{3, 4\}$ modulo 3, 5, and 7, respectively. By the reconstruction algorithm obtained in [13], we have $\{Q_1, Q_2\} = \{10, 18\}$. By (17), we can reconstruct the two integers $\{N_1, N_2\}$ as $\{1098, 1898\}$.

IV. A Robust Generalized CRT for Two Integers

In this section, we discuss a robust generalized CRT for two integers when the residue sets have errors.

A. Remainders with Errors

As discussed above, the two common remainders, $\{r_1^c, r_2^c\}$, are the key of the reconstruction of integers $\{N_1, N_2\}$. When remainders are error-free, the two common remainders can be directly determined by any residue set of $\{N_1, N_2\}$. However, this may not be true when residue sets have errors. Take Example 2 for example. Suppose that the erroneous residue sets are $\tilde{R}_1(N_1, N_2) = \{108, 209\}$, $\tilde{R}_2(N_1, N_2) = \{92, 399\}$, and $\tilde{R}_3(N_1, N_2) = \{397, 507\}$. Then, the residue sets modulo M are $\{8, 9\}$, $\{92, 99\}$, and $\{7, 97\}$, respectively. Clearly, the erroneous residue sets $\tilde{R}_k(N_1, N_2)$ modulo M are different from each other and we can not directly determine the common remainders $\{r_1^c, r_2^c\}$ from $\tilde{R}_k(N_1, N_2)$.

Let $\tilde{r}_{l,k}^c$ be the remainder of $\tilde{r}_{l,k}$ modulo M, i.e.,

$$\tilde{r}_{l,k}^c = \langle \tilde{r}_{l,k} \rangle_M, \ l = 1, 2; \ k = 1, \ldots, K. \tag{19}$$

In case $\tilde{R}_k(N_1, N_2)$ has only one element, i.e., $\tilde{r}_{1,k} = \tilde{r}_{2,k}$, we have $\tilde{r}_{1,k}^c = \tilde{r}_{2,k}^c$ counted twice (repeated once) in the above sequence. This provides total $2K$ common remainders and some of them may be the same. In order to estimate two common remainders from these $2K$ common remainders $\tilde{r}_{1,1}^c, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{1,K}^c$, $\tilde{r}_{2,1}^c, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{2,K}^c$, two appropriate clusters, each of which contains K remainders, are formed first. Intuitively

the deviation of two clusters should be large. Now, we determine two clusters from these erroneous residue sets. For convenience, we denote these $2K$ common remainders as $\tilde{r}_1^c, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{2K}^c$ and then sort them in the increasing order as follows

$$\tilde{r}_{\varsigma(1)}^c \leq \cdots \leq \tilde{r}_{\varsigma(2K)}^c, \tag{20}$$

where ς is a permutation of the set $\{1, \ldots, 2K\}$.

For any two adjacent common remainders $\tilde{r}_{\varsigma(k)}^c$ and $\tilde{r}_{\varsigma(k+1)}^c$, we define the distance D_k as

$$D_k = \begin{cases} \tilde{r}_{\varsigma(k+1)}^c - \tilde{r}_{\varsigma(k)}^c, & \text{if } k = 1, \ldots, 2K-1 \\ \tilde{r}_{\varsigma(1)}^c - \tilde{r}_{\varsigma(2K)}^c + M, & \text{if } k = 2K. \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

It is clear that the nonnegative distances D_k satisfy the following equation

$$\sum_{k=1}^{2K} D_k = M. \tag{22}$$

Moreover, we have the following results.

Lemma 2: Let $\tau = \max\{|\Delta r_{l,k}|,\ l = 1, 2;\ k = 1, \ldots, K\}$, where $\Delta r_{l,k}$ are the remainder errors as defined in (5). If $\tau < M/8$, then there exists one and only one subscript $k_0 \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ such that

$$D_{k_0} + D_{k_0+K} > M/2. \tag{23}$$

Moreover, if we let

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_1 &\triangleq \{\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_K\} = \left\{\tilde{r}_{\varsigma(k_0+1)}^c, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{\varsigma(k_0+K)}^c\right\}, \\ \Omega_2 &\triangleq \{\upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_K\} = \begin{cases} \left\{\tilde{r}_{\varsigma(1)}^c, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{\varsigma(K)}^c\right\}, & \text{if } k_0 = K \\ \left\{\tilde{r}_{\varsigma(k_0+1+K)}^c - M, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{\varsigma(2K)}^c - M, \tilde{r}_{\varsigma(1)}^c, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{\varsigma(k_0)}^c\right\}, & \text{if } k_0 \neq K, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

with $\omega_i \leq \omega_j$, $\upsilon_i \leq \upsilon_j$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq K$, then we have

$$\omega_K - \omega_1 \leq 2\tau,\ \upsilon_K - \upsilon_1 \leq 2\tau. \tag{25}$$

This Lemma is proved in Appendix A.

Example 3. Let us consider the example proposed at the beginning of this section. By (20), we obtain the remainder sequence $\{\tilde{r}_1^c, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{2K}^c\} = \{8, 9, 92, 99, 97, 7\}$ and its sorted sequence $\{\tilde{r}_{\varsigma(1)}^c, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{\varsigma(2K)}^c\}$ in (20) as

$$0 < 7 < 8 < 9 < 92 < 97 < 99 < M = 100.$$

Since $D_3 + D_6 = (92 - 9) + (7 - 99 + 100) = 83 + 8 > M/2$, we know that $k_0 = 3$ and obtain from (24) that the two clusters are

$$\Omega_1 = \{92, 97, 99\},\ \Omega_2 = \{7, 8, 9\}. \tag{26}$$

Before getting the properties of the two clusters Ω_1 and Ω_2, we introduce a kind of circular distance below.

Definition 2: For real numbers x and y, the circular distance of x to y for a non-zero positive number C is defined as

$$d_C(x,y) \triangleq x - y - \left[\frac{x-y}{C}\right] C, \tag{27}$$

where $[\cdot]$ stands for the rounding integer, i.e., for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathbb{R}$ denotes the set of all reals, $[x]$ is an integer and subject to

$$-1/2 \leq x - [x] < 1/2. \tag{28}$$

Corollary 2: Let $\tau = \max\{|\Delta r_{l,k}|,\ l = 1,2;\ k = 1,\ldots,K\}$ and $\tau < M/8$. If $M/4 \leq |d_M(r_1^c, r_2^c)| \leq M/2$, then for every $k \in \{1,\ldots,K\}$, there exist ω_{k_1} in Ω_1 and υ_{k_2} in Ω_2 such that either

$$d_M(\tilde{r}_{1,k}^c, \omega_{k_1}) = 0 \text{ and } d_M(\tilde{r}_{2,k}^c, \upsilon_{k_2}) = 0 \tag{29}$$

or

$$d_M(\tilde{r}_{2,k}^c, \omega_{k_1}) = 0 \text{ and } d_M(\tilde{r}_{1,k}^c, \upsilon_{k_2}) = 0, \tag{30}$$

where $k_1, k_2 \in \{1,\ldots,K\}$, Ω_1 and Ω_2 are defined in (24).

The proof of this corollary is in Appendix B.

Based on the two clusters Ω_1 and Ω_2, we can estimate the two common remainders $\{r_1^c, r_2^c\}$ firstly. Let

$$\omega_k' = \begin{cases} \omega_k, & \text{if } \omega_K - \upsilon_1 \leq M/2 \\ \omega_k - M, & \text{if } \omega_K - \upsilon_1 > M/2, \end{cases} \tag{31}$$

for all k, where $k \in \{1,\ldots,K\}$. Then, the two common remainders $\{r_1^c, r_2^c\}$ can be estimated as $\{\overline{\omega}_1, \overline{\omega}_2\}$:

$$\overline{\omega}_1 \triangleq \frac{\omega_1' + \cdots + \omega_K'}{K},\ \overline{\omega}_2 \triangleq \frac{\upsilon_1 + \cdots + \upsilon_K}{K}. \tag{32}$$

Note that $\overline{\omega}_1$ and $\overline{\omega}_2$ defined in (32) may be negative values. After cancelling the appropriate estimate of common remainder from the erroneous remainders $\tilde{r}_{l,k}$, we can obtain the estimates of integers $q_{l,k}$ in (18), denoted as $\hat{q}_{l,k}$:

$$\hat{q}_{l,k} = \left[\frac{\tilde{r}_{l,k} - \overline{\omega}_t}{M}\right],\ l = 1,2;\ k = 1,\ldots,K, \tag{33}$$

where $[\cdot]$ is the rounding operation, and t is

$$t = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } d_M(\tilde{r}_{l,k}^c, \omega_{k_1}) = 0 \text{ for some } k_1 \\ 2, & \text{if } d_M(\tilde{r}_{l,k}^c, \upsilon_{k_2}) = 0 \text{ for some } k_2, \end{cases} \tag{34}$$

with $k_1, k_2 \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$. Let

$$R_k(\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2) = \{\hat{q}_{1,k}, \hat{q}_{2,k}\}, \ k = 1, \ldots, K. \tag{35}$$

Then, the two estimates $\{\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2\}$ of the integers $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$ can be reconstructed from their residue sets $R_1(\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2)$, $\ldots, R_K(\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2)$ modulo $\mathcal{M}'$ by using the generalized CRT for two integers obtained in [13].

Example 4. Let us consider Example 3. Since $\omega_3 - \upsilon_1 = 99 - 7 = 92 > M/2$, we obtain

$$\omega_1' = -8, \ \omega_2' = -3, \ \omega_3' = -1.$$

Recall that $\upsilon_1 = 7$, $\upsilon_2 = 8$, and $\upsilon_3 = 9$. According to the definitions of $\overline{\omega}_1$ and $\overline{\omega}_2$ in (32), we have

$$\overline{\omega}_1 = -4, \ \overline{\omega}_2 = 8.$$

By (33) and (35), we obtain

$$R_1(\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2) = \{1, 2\}, R_2(\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2) = \{1, 4\}, R_3(\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2) = \{4, 5\}.$$

By using the generalized CRT for two integers obtained in [13], we have

$$\{\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2\} = \{11, 19\}.$$

Now, we estimate the two integers $\{N_1, N_2\}$ after the estimates $\{\overline{\omega}_1, \overline{\omega}_2\}$ of the two common remainders and $\{\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2\}$ are obtained. The estimates of $\{N_1, N_2\}$ are denoted as $\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\}$ in the following.

1) $\hat{Q}_1 = \hat{Q}_2 = \hat{Q}$.

In this case, the estimates $\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\}$ can be reconstructed as

$$\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\} = \{M\hat{Q} + \overline{\omega}_1, M\hat{Q} + \overline{\omega}_2\}. \tag{36}$$

2) $\hat{Q}_1 \neq \hat{Q}_2$.

In this case, we can not determine $\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\}$ from $\{\overline{\omega}_1, \overline{\omega}_2\}$ and $\{\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2\}$, which is because the correspondence between the elements in two sets $\{\overline{\omega}_1, \overline{\omega}_2\}$ and $\{\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2\}$ is not known. To be specific, we cannot determine whether $\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\}$ are $\{M\hat{Q}_1 + \overline{\omega}_1, M\hat{Q}_2 + \overline{\omega}_2\}$ or $\{M\hat{Q}_1 + \overline{\omega}_2, M\hat{Q}_2 + \overline{\omega}_1\}$. Next, we modify the two estimates $\{\overline{\omega}_1, \overline{\omega}_2\}$ of the common remainders $\{r_1^c, r_2^c\}$ so that the modified estimates $\hat{r}_1^c$ and $\hat{r}_2^c$ correspond to $\hat{Q}_1$ and $\hat{Q}_2$, respectively. The main processes are two: Firstly, we select the elements from $\{\omega_1', \ldots, \omega_K'\}$ and $\{\upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_K\}$ to form two groups, where all the elements in one group correspond to $\hat{Q}_1$ and the other correspond to $\hat{Q}_2$. Then, $\hat{r}_1^c$ and $\hat{r}_2^c$ are determined by averaging the groups corresponding to $\hat{Q}_1$ and $\hat{Q}_2$, respectively.

Recall that the estimates $\{\overline{\omega}_1, \overline{\omega}_2\}$ of the two common remainders defined in (32) are the average values of the two clusters $\{\omega'_1, \ldots, \omega'_K\}$ and $\{\upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_K\}$. For convenience, we let

$$\Omega' \triangleq \{\omega'_1, \ldots, \omega'_K, \upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_K\}. \tag{37}$$

By (24) and (31), we know that the elements in Ω' are either $\tilde{r}^c_{\varsigma(i)}$ or $\tilde{r}^c_{\varsigma(i)} - M$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, 2K$. From the definitions of $\tilde{r}^c_{\varsigma(i)}$ in (20), we know that $\{\tilde{r}^c_{\varsigma(1)}, \ldots, \tilde{r}^c_{\varsigma(2K)}\}$ are the $2K$ sorted common remainders from $\{\tilde{r}^c_{1,1}, \ldots, \tilde{r}^c_{1,K}, \tilde{r}^c_{2,1}, \ldots, \tilde{r}^c_{2,K}\}$. Hence, for all $l = 1, 2; k = 1, \ldots, K$, either $\tilde{r}^c_{l,k}$ or $\tilde{r}^c_{l,k} - M$ is included in Ω', and in the meanwhile, Ω' only consists of these $2K$ elements. In the following, for convenience, we call both $\tilde{r}^c_{l,k}$ and $\tilde{r}^c_{l,k} - M$ as the common remainders of $\tilde{r}_{l,k}$.

When $\hat{Q}_1 \neq \hat{Q}_2$, we know from the traditional CRT that there exists at least a subscript $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ such that

$$\hat{q}_{1,k} \neq \hat{q}_{2,k}. \tag{38}$$

Let $\mathcal{K} \triangleq \{k_1, \ldots, k_p\}$, $1 \leq k_i \leq K$, be all the distinct subscripts of $\hat{q}_{1,k_i}$ (or $\hat{q}_{2,k_i}$) satisfying (38), i.e., $\hat{q}_{1,k_i} \neq \hat{q}_{2,k_i}$, and thus from (38), we have $p \geq 1$. When $\hat{q}_{1,k_i} \neq \hat{q}_{2,k_i}$, the correspondence between $\{\hat{q}_{1,k_i}, \hat{q}_{2,k_i}\}$ and $\{\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2\}$ is known because we can determine $\hat{q}_{l,k_i}$ by the obtained integers $\hat{Q}_l$ modulo m_{k_i}, i.e.,

$$\hat{q}_{l,k_i} = \langle \hat{Q}_l \rangle_{m_{k_i}}, \ l = 1, 2, \tag{39}$$

for every i, $1 \leq i \leq p$. Note that the obtained values $\hat{q}_{1,k_i}$ and $\hat{q}_{2,k_i}$ above are the same the values as determined by (33) from the residue set $\{\tilde{r}_{1,k_i}, \tilde{r}_{2,k_i}\}$. From $\hat{q}_{1,k_i} \neq \hat{q}_{2,k_i}$, we deduce that $\tilde{r}_{1,k_i} \neq \tilde{r}_{2,k_i}$. Thus, the correspondence between $\{\hat{q}_{1,k_i}, \hat{q}_{2,k_i}\}$ and $\{\tilde{r}_{1,k_i}, \tilde{r}_{2,k_i}\}$ (or $\{\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2\}$) is known as well. Assume that the common remainders of $\tilde{r}_{1,k_i}$ and $\tilde{r}_{2,k_i}$ in Ω' are $\hat{r}^c_{1,k_i}$ and $\hat{r}^c_{2,k_i}$, respectively. As discussed above, $\hat{r}^c_{1,k_i}$ are either $\tilde{r}^c_{1,k_i}$ or $\tilde{r}^c_{1,k_i} - M$, and $\hat{r}^c_{2,k_i}$ are either $\tilde{r}^c_{2,k_i}$ or $\tilde{r}^c_{2,k_i} - M$. Thus, $\hat{r}^c_{1,k_i}$ and $\hat{r}^c_{2,k_i}$ can be determined by

$$d_M(\tilde{r}^c_{1,k_i}, \hat{r}^c_{1,k_i}) = 0, \ d_M(\tilde{r}^c_{2,k_i}, \hat{r}^c_{2,k_i}) = 0, \ \hat{r}^c_{1,k_i}, \hat{r}^c_{2,k_i} \in \Omega', \tag{40}$$

where $k_i \in \mathcal{K}$. By (19), we know that $\hat{r}^c_{1,k_i}$ and $\hat{r}^c_{2,k_i}$ can also be determined by

$$d_M(\tilde{r}_{1,k_i}, \hat{r}^c_{1,k_i}) = 0, \ d_M(\tilde{r}_{2,k_i}, \hat{r}^c_{2,k_i}) = 0, \ \hat{r}^c_{1,k_i}, \hat{r}^c_{2,k_i} \in \Omega'. \tag{41}$$

Clearly, $\hat{r}^c_{1,k_i}$ and $\hat{r}^c_{2,k_i}$ correspond to the remainders $\tilde{r}_{1,k_i}$ and $\tilde{r}_{2,k_i}$, respectively. Hence, $\hat{r}^c_{1,k_i}$ corresponds to $\hat{Q}_1$, while $\hat{r}^c_{2,k_i}$ corresponds to $\hat{Q}_2$. We use the average common remainders of $\{\hat{r}^c_{1,k_1}, \ldots, \hat{r}^c_{1,k_p}\}$ and $\{\hat{r}^c_{2,k_1}, \ldots, \hat{r}^c_{2,k_p}\}$ as the estimates of r^c_1 and r^c_2, respectively, i.e.,

$$\hat{r}^c_1 \triangleq \frac{\hat{r}^c_{1,k_1} + \cdots + \hat{r}^c_{1,k_p}}{p}, \ \hat{r}^c_2 \triangleq \frac{\hat{r}^c_{2,k_1} + \cdots + \hat{r}^c_{2,k_p}}{p}. \tag{42}$$

Then, the estimates $\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\}$ can be reconstructed as

$$\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\} = \{M\hat{Q}_1 + \hat{r}_1^c, M\hat{Q}_2 + \hat{r}_2^c\}. \tag{43}$$

Noting that the estimates $\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\}$ obtained by (36) or (43) may be non-integers. For this case, we use $\big\{[\hat{N}_1], [\hat{N}_2]\big\}$ as the estimates of the integers $\{N_1, N_2\}$, where $[\cdot]$ denotes the rounding operation defined in (28).

Example 5. Let us consider Example 4. Note that $\{\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2\} = \{11, 19\}$ calculated before. Then, the remainders of $\hat{Q}_1 = 11$ and $\hat{Q}_2 = 19$ modulo $\mathcal{M}' = \{3, 5, 7\}$ are $\{\hat{q}_{1,1}, \hat{q}_{1,2}, \hat{q}_{1,3}\} = \{2, 1, 4\}$ and $\{\hat{q}_{2,1}, \hat{q}_{2,2}, \hat{q}_{2,3}\} = \{1, 4, 5\}$, respectively. Clearly, $\hat{q}_{1,1} \neq \hat{q}_{2,1}$, $\hat{q}_{1,2} \neq \hat{q}_{2,2}$, and $\hat{q}_{1,3} \neq \hat{q}_{2,3}$. Recall that the erroneous residue sets are $\tilde{R}_1(N_1, N_2) = \{108, 209\}$, $\tilde{R}_2(N_1, N_2) = \{92, 399\}$, and $\tilde{R}_3(N_1, N_2) = \{397, 507\}$. According to (33), we deduce that $\{\tilde{r}_{1,1}, \tilde{r}_{1,2}, \tilde{r}_{1,3}\} = \{209, 92, 397\}$, $\{\tilde{r}_{2,1}, \tilde{r}_{2,2}, \tilde{r}_{2,3}\} = \{108, 399, 507\}$. By (37), we have

$$\Omega' = \{\omega_1', \omega_2', \omega_3', \upsilon_1, \upsilon_2, \upsilon_3\} = \{-8, -3, -1, 7, 8, 9\}.$$

Note that

$$d_M(\tilde{r}_{1,1}, 9) = 0,\ d_M(\tilde{r}_{1,2}, -8) = 0,\ d_M(\tilde{r}_{1,3}, -3) = 0.$$

By (41), we obtain that the common remainders $\hat{r}_{1,1}^c$, $\hat{r}_{1,2}^c$, and $\hat{r}_{1,3}^c$ are

$$\hat{r}_{1,1}^c = 9,\ \hat{r}_{1,2}^c = -8,\ \hat{r}_{1,3}^c = -3.$$

From (42), we obtain

$$\hat{r}_1^c = -2/3.$$

Similarly, we have

$$d_M(\tilde{r}_{2,1}, 8) = 0,\ d_M(\tilde{r}_{2,2}, -1) = 0,\ d_M(\tilde{r}_{2,3}, 7) = 0.$$

Hence,

$$\hat{r}_{2,1}^c = 8,\ \hat{r}_{2,2}^c = -1,\ \hat{r}_{2,3}^c = 7,$$

and then we obtain from (42) that $\hat{r}_2^c = 14/3$. By (43), we have

$$\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\} = \Big\{1099\frac{1}{3}, 1904\frac{2}{3}\Big\}.$$

Therefore, the estimates of the two integers $\{N_1, N_2\}$ are $\{1099, 1905\}$. Note that the true values of the two integers are $\{1098, 1898\}$.

Next theorem shows that the above estimates $\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\}$ of the two integers $\{N_1, N_2\}$ are robust when the remainder error bound is less than $M/8$.

Theorem 2: Let $\tau = \max\{|\Delta r_{l,k}|,\ l = 1, 2;\ k = 1, \ldots, K\}$, where $\Delta r_{l,k}$ are the remainder errors as defined in (5). If $\tau < M/8$, then we have

$$\left|\hat{N}_l - N_l\right| \leq \tau,\ l = 1, 2, \tag{44}$$

where $\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\}$ are defined in (36) or (43).

The proof of this theorem is in Appendix C.

Let us recall the example presented at the beginning of this section. Note that the remainder error bound $\tau = 11$, which is less than the robustness error upper bound $M/8 = 12.5$. By Theorem 2, we know that the estimates are robust. In fact, according to Example 5, the maximal estimation error of the two integers is 7, which is small than the remainder error bound τ and conforms the result obtained in Theorem 2.

B. Robust Generalized CRT Algorithm for Two Integers

To summarize what we have studied before, we obtain the following robust generalized CRT algorithm for two integers.

Robust Generalized CRT for Two Integers

Step 1 Calculate $\tilde{r}_{l,k}^c$ in (19) and sort them in the increasing order as (20).

Step 2 Compute k_0 as

$$k_0 = \arg \max_{k \in \{1,\ldots,K\}} \{D_k + D_{k+K}\}, \tag{45}$$

where D_k is defined in (21).

Step 3 Obtain the two clusters Ω_1 and Ω_2 by (24).

Step 4 Calculate $\overline{\omega}_1$ and $\overline{\omega}_2$ by (32).

Step 5 Determine residue sets $R_k(\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2)$ as

$$R_k(\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2) = \{\hat{q}_{1,k}, \hat{q}_{2,k}\}, \tag{46}$$

where $\hat{q}_{l,k}$ are defined in (33).

Step 6 Reconstruct $\{\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2\}$ by using the generalized CRT for two integers obtained in [13].

Step 7 Reconstruct $\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\}$ by (36) or (43).

Although the above robust generalized CRT is for two integers, it is straightforward to be generalized to two reals as the case of one integer in our previous work [34], [36].

V. Simulation Results

In this section, we show some simulations to illustrate the performance of the proposed robust generalized CRT for two integers and its application in two frequency determination from multiple undersampled waveforms.

Let us first consider the estimation error versus the error upper bound for the proposed robust generalized CRT for two integers. By Theorem 2, we know that the maximal error level τ needs to be upper bounded by $\tau < M/8$ for the robustness. In the simulation, parameter $M = 100$, and the co-prime integers from m_1 to m_3 are 3, 5, and 7, respectively. Two unknown integers $\{N_1, N_2\}$ are chosen uniformly at random from the interval $[0, 2000)$ and the maximal error levels are set as $\tau = 0, 3, 6, 9, 12, 15$. For these maximal error levels, the last one, 15, does not satisfy the robustness upper bound $\tau < M/8 = 100/8 = 12.5$. We call the process of determining $\{N_1, N_2\}$ as a trial, and 10000 trials for each of the maximal error level are simulated. In Fig. 1, we present the curve of the mean error E_N versus the maximal error level τ. The mean error is defined as

$$E_N = E_{trials}\left\{\frac{1}{2}\sum_{l=1,2}|\hat{N}_l - N_l|\right\}, \tag{47}$$

where E_{trials} stands for the mean over all the trials, N_l and $\hat{N}_l$ are the true integers and the estimates in one trial, respectively. Fig. 1 shows that the two integers can be robustly reconstructed from their erroneous residue sets by using the proposed robust generalized CRT for two integers, i.e., when all the errors of the remainders are less than the error upper bound, the reconstruction errors of $\{N_1, N_2\}$ are also less than this bound. It also shows that the reconstruction errors of the two integers are small compared to their dynamic range. However, when the robustness upper bound $\tau < M/8$ is not satisfied as when $\tau = 15$, as one can see from Fig. 1, the robustness may not hold anymore.

For the application in two frequency determination from multiple undersampled waveforms, we set three sampling frequencies: Mm_1, Mm_2, and Mm_3. Two frequencies $\{f_1, f_2\}$ are taken integers randomly and uniformly distributed in the range $\left(0, 2M\sqrt{m_1m_2m_3}\right)$. The noise $w(t)$ in (1) is additive white Gaussian noise with mean zero and variance $10^{-SNR/10}$, and the number of trials is 10000 for each signal-to-noise ratio (SNR). In the simulation, the observation of the time duration is 1s. Three methods are considered: the (optimal) searching based method, the proposed robust generalized CRT for two integers and the non-robust generalized CRT for two integers. In the searching based method, we search the proper folding integers $\hat{n}_{l,k}$ that corresponds to the remainders $\tilde{r}_{l,k}$ from all the possible integers.

Then the two frequencies are estimated as

$$\hat{f}_l = \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \hat{n}_{l,k} M m_k + \tilde{r}_{l,k} \right], \ l = 1, 2. \tag{48}$$

In non-robust generalized CRT for two integers, we choose the average of the common remainders by using an arbitrary grouping, and then reconstruct the different integers by using the algorithm proposed in Section III. In Fig. 2, we compare the different methods by investigating the mean relative error E_f versus SNR of the two estimated frequencies for different M and m_i. The mean relative error is defined as

$$E_f = E_{trials} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=1,2} \frac{|\hat{f}_l - f_l|}{f_l} \right\}, \tag{49}$$

where f_l and $\hat{f}_l$ are the true frequencies and the estimates in one trial, respectively. Fig. 2 shows that the non-robust generalized CRT for two integers suffers from the error floor problem, i.e., the mean relative error will not decrease or decrease very slowly at high SNR. On the contrary, the mean relative error of the robust generalized CRT and the searching based method for two integers decreases sharply as SNR increases all the time. The proposed robust generalized CRT performs slightly worse than the searching based method, but has a much less computation. In fact, the computational complexity of the searching method and our proposed method are in the order of $2^K \Gamma^{2(K-1)}$ and $6K^2$, respectively. Fig. 2 also shows that while the other parameters, such as the sampling rates, are similar, the larger M is, the better reconstruction is, i.e., the better performance is, which is in agreement with our theory.



Fig. 1. Estimation errors and the obtained estimation error upper bound using the robust generalized CRT for two integers.



Fig. 2. Mean relative error versus SNR of the two estimated frequencies.

VI. Conclusion

In this paper, we studied a robust generalized CRT for determining two integers from their residue sets and moduli, where the remainders of the two integers in each residue set are not ordered and may have errors. We first obtained the largest dynamic range of two integers from their error free residue sets of a given modulus set, where all the moduli have a gcd M larger than 1 and the remaining integers factorized by the gcd of all the moduli are pairwise co-prime. We also presented an efficient reconstruction algorithm of two integers from their error free residue sets, when the two integers are within the largest dynamic range. We then proved that the two integers can be robustly reconstructed if their remainder errors are less than the eighth of the gcd of all the moduli. Finally, we applied the proposed robust generalized CRT for two integers to the determination of two frequencies from multiple undersampled waveforms. Our numerical results showed that the frequency determination performance using our newly proposed robust generalized CRT is better than that using the non-robust generalized CRT. Compared with the optimal searching based method, it has a slightly worse performance but much less computation.

Appendix

A. Proof of Lemma 2

Proof: Without loss of generality, we suppose $r_1^c \leq r_2^c$. Our proof consists of two steps: firstly, we prove that there exists a subscript $k_0 \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ satisfying (23). Furthermore, we obtain two clusters, Ω_1 and Ω_2, and prove that they satisfy (25). Then, we prove the uniqueness of such k_0. By the definition

of circular distance in (27), we obtain

$$0 \leq |d_M(r_1^c, r_2^c)| \leq M/2. \tag{50}$$

Then, we have two cases below.

Case 1: $0 \leq |d_M(r_1^c, r_2^c)| < M/4$.

In this case, we have $0 \leq r_2^c - r_1^c < M/4$ or $3M/4 < r_2^c - r_1^c < M$. Let ρ and π be two permutations of the set $\{1, \ldots, K\}$ such that

$$\Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} \leq \cdots \leq \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} \text{ and } \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} \leq \cdots \leq \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}, \tag{51}$$

respectively, where $\Delta r_{\rho_{(k)}} \in \{\Delta r_{1,1}, \ldots, \Delta r_{1,K}\}$, $\Delta r_{\pi_{(k)}} \in \{\Delta r_{2,1}, \ldots, \Delta r_{2,K}\}$ for $k = 1, \ldots, K$. Define

$$\{c_1, \ldots, c_{2K}\} \triangleq \begin{cases} \left\{r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}, \ldots, r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}, \ldots, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}\right\}, & \text{if } 0 \leq r_2^c - r_1^c < M/4 \\ \left\{r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}, \ldots, r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} - M, \ldots, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} - M\right\}, & \text{if } 3M/4 < r_2^c - r_1^c < M. \end{cases} \tag{52}$$

where c_i are sorted in the increasing order as

$$c_1 \leq \cdots \leq c_{2K}. \tag{53}$$

Note that $|\Delta_{l,k}| < M/8$ for $l = 1, 2; k = 1, \ldots, K$. If $0 \leq r_2^c - r_1^c < M/4$, then we have

$$-M/4 < r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} - r_1^c - \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} < M/2. \tag{54}$$

If $3M/4 < r_2^c - r_1^c < M$, then we have

$$-M/4 < r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} - (r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} - M) < M/2. \tag{55}$$

Therefore,

$$0 \leq c_{2K} - c_1 < M/2. \tag{56}$$

Let

$$c_i = \alpha_i + \ell_i M, \ i = 1, \ldots, 2K, \tag{57}$$

where $0 \leq \alpha_i < M$ and $\ell_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, we obtain from (53) that

$$\ell_1 \leq \cdots \leq \ell_{2K}. \tag{58}$$

By (56) and (57), we have

$$0 \leq \alpha_{2K} - \alpha_1 + (\ell_{2K} - \ell_1)M < M/2. \tag{59}$$

Since $0 \leq \alpha_i < M$, we have $-M < \alpha_{2K} - \alpha_1 < M$. It follows from (58) and (59) that

$$\ell_{2K} - \ell_1 = 0 \text{ or } 1.$$

Subcase 1: $\ell_{2K} - \ell_1 = 0$.

In this case, $\ell_1 = \cdots = \ell_{2K}$. From (59), we have

$$0 \leq \alpha_{2K} - \alpha_1 < M/2, \tag{60}$$

and from (53) and (57) we have

$$0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \cdots \leq \alpha_{2K} < M. \tag{61}$$

From (5) and (15), we have

$$\tilde{r}_{l,k} = Mq_{l,k} + r_l^c + \Delta r_{l,k},\ l = 1, 2;\ k = 1, \ldots, K. \tag{62}$$

Hence,

$$\langle \tilde{r}_{l,k} \rangle_M = \langle r_l^c + \Delta r_{l,k} \rangle_M,\ l = 1, 2;\ k = 1, \ldots, K. \tag{63}$$

On the other hand, we obtain from (57) that

$$\langle c_i \rangle_M = \alpha_i,\ i = 1, \ldots, 2K. \tag{64}$$

Combining (52), (63), and (64), we have that $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{2K}\}$ are the $2K$ remainders $\{\tilde{r}_1^c, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{2K}^c\}$. Hence, (20) is equivalent to (61). If we let $k_0 = K$, then we obtain from (60) that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{k_0} + D_{k_0+K} &= D_{k_0} + \tilde{r}_{\varsigma(1)}^c - \tilde{r}_{\varsigma(2K)}^c + M \\ &= D_{k_0} + \alpha_1 - \alpha_{2K} + M \\ &> M/2. \end{aligned}$$

By the definitions of Ω_1 and Ω_2, we obtain from (61) that

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_1 &= \{\alpha_{K+1}, \ldots, \alpha_{2K}\} = \{c_{K+1} - \ell_{K+1}M, \ldots, c_{2K} - \ell_{2K}M\}, \\ \Omega_2 &= \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_K\} = \{c_1 - \ell_1 M, \ldots, c_K - \ell_K M\}. \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

Recall that $c_1, \ldots, c_{2K}$ are sorted in the increasing order from erroneous remainders $r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}, \ldots, r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}, \ldots, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}$. Since $|\Delta r_{l,k}| \leq \tau$ for $l = 1, 2; k = 1, \ldots, K$, we have

$$c_K - c_1 \leq 2\tau,\ c_{2K} - c_{K+1} \leq 2\tau. \tag{66}$$

Thus,

$$\omega_K - \omega_1 = \alpha_{2K} - \alpha_{K+1} = c_{2K} - c_{K+1} \leq 2\tau,$$

$$\upsilon_K - \upsilon_1 = \alpha_K - \alpha_1 = c_K - c_1 \leq 2\tau.$$

Subcase 2: $\ell_{2K} - \ell_1 = 1$.

In this case, there exist some $j \in \{1, \ldots, 2K\}$ satisfying $\ell_{j+1} - \ell_j = 1$. Due to (58), such subscript j is the only one. Moreover, we have $\ell_1 = \cdots = \ell_j$ and $\ell_{j+1} = \cdots = \ell_{2K}$. From (53), (56), and (57), we have

$$\alpha_1 \leq \cdots \leq \alpha_j,\ \alpha_j - \alpha_1 < M/2,$$

$$\alpha_{j+1} \leq \cdots \leq \alpha_{2K},\ \alpha_{2K} - \alpha_{j+1} < M/2.$$

Since $0 \leq c_{2K} - c_1 < M/2$ and $\ell_{2K} - \ell_1 = 1$, we obtain from (57) that $\alpha_{2K} - \alpha_1 < -M/2$, i.e.,

$$\alpha_1 - \alpha_{2K} > M/2. \tag{67}$$

Thus,

$$0 \leq \alpha_{j+1} \leq \cdots \leq \alpha_{2K} < \alpha_1 \leq \cdots \leq \alpha_j < M. \tag{68}$$

Note that $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{2K}\}$ are the $2K$ remainders $\{\tilde{r}_1^c, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{2K}^c\}$. Hence, (20) is equivalent to (68).
1) If $j < K$ and let $k_0 = K - j$, then we obtain from (67) that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{k_0} + D_{k_0+K} &= D_{k_0} + \tilde{r}^c_{\varsigma(2K-j+1)} - \tilde{r}^c_{\varsigma(2K-j)} \\ &= D_{k_0} + \alpha_1 - \alpha_{2K} \\ &> M/2. \end{aligned}$$

By the definitions of Ω_1 and Ω_2, we obtain from (68) that

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_1 &= \{\alpha_{K+1}, \ldots, \alpha_{2K}\} = \{c_{K+1} - \ell_{K+1}M, \ldots, c_{2K} - \ell_{2K}M\}, \\ \Omega_2 &= \{\alpha_1 - M, \ldots, \alpha_j - M, \alpha_{j+1}, \ldots, \alpha_K\} \\ &= \{c_1 - M - \ell_1 M, \ldots, c_j - M - \ell_j M, c_{j+1} - \ell_{j+1}M, \ldots, c_K - \ell_K M\}. \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

Hence, similar to (66) we have

$$\omega_K - \omega_1 = c_{2K} - c_{K+1} \leq 2\tau,\ \upsilon_K - \upsilon_1 = c_K - c_1 \leq 2\tau.$$

2) If $j \geq K$ and let $k_0 = 2K - j$, then we obtain from (67) that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{k_0} + D_{k_0+K} &= \tilde{r}^c_{\varsigma_{(2K-j+1)}} - \tilde{r}^c_{\varsigma_{(2K-j)}} + D_{k_0+K} \\ &= \alpha_1 - \alpha_{2K} + D_{k_0+K} \\ &> M/2. \end{aligned}$$

By the definitions of Ω_1 and Ω_2, we obtain from (68) that

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_1 &= \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_K\} = \{c_1 - \ell_1 M, \ldots, c_K - \ell_K M\}, \\ \Omega_2 &= \{\alpha_{K+1} - M, \ldots, \alpha_j - M, \alpha_{j+1}, \ldots, \alpha_{2K}\} \\ &= \{c_{K+1} - M - \ell_{K+1} M, \ldots, c_j - M - \ell_j M, c_{j+1} - \ell_{j+1} M, \ldots, c_{2K} - \ell_{2K} M\}. \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

Hence, similar to (66) we have

$$\omega_K - \omega_1 = \alpha_K - \alpha_1 = c_K - c_1 \leq 2\tau,$$

$$\upsilon_K - \upsilon_1 = \alpha_{2K} - \alpha_{K+1} + M = c_{2K} - c_{K+1} \leq 2\tau.$$

Case 2: $M/4 \leq |d_M(r_1^c, r_2^c)| \leq M/2$.

In this case, we have $M/4 \leq r_2^c - r_1^c \leq M/2$ or $M/2 < r_2^c - r_1^c \leq 3M/4$. Hence, $M/4 \leq r_2^c - r_1^c \leq 3M/4$. Since $|\Delta r_{l,k}| < M/8$ for $l = 1, 2$; $k = 1, \ldots, K$, we have

$$0 < r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(k_2)}} - r_1^c - \Delta r_{\rho_{(k_1)}} < M \tag{71}$$

for any $k_1, k_2 \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$. Hence, we obtain

$$r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} > r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} \tag{72}$$

and

$$r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} < r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} + M. \tag{73}$$

Since $0 \leq r_1^c, r_2^c < M$, $r_2^c - r_1^c \geq M/4$ and $|\Delta r_{l,k}| < M/8$, we have

$$-M/8 < r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(k_1)}} \leq r_2^c - M/4 + \Delta r_{\rho_{(k_2)}} < M \tag{74}$$

and

$$0 < r_1^c + M/4 + \Delta r_{\pi_{(k_1)}} \leq r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(k_2)}} < 9M/8 \tag{75}$$

for any $k_1, k_2 \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$. By (71) and (74), we obtain that if there exist some $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ satisfying $r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(k)}} < 0$, then we have $r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(k_2)}} < M$ for any $k_2 \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$. By (71) and (75), we obtain that if there exist some $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ satisfying $r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(k)}} > M$, then we have $r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(k_1)}} > 0$ for any $k_1 \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$. Hence, we have three cases below.

Subcase 1: $r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(k)}} < 0$ for some $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$.

Define $k' \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ as

$$k' \triangleq \begin{cases} K, & \text{if } r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} < 0 \\ \max\left\{k \colon r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(k)}} < 0, r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(k+1)}} \geq 0\right\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

1) $k' = K$.

Combining (72) and (73), we have

$$0 < r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} \leq \cdots \leq r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} < r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} + M \leq \cdots \leq r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} + M < M. \tag{76}$$

From (63) and (76), we obtain that $\left\{r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} + M, \ldots, r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} + M, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}, \ldots, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}\right\}$ are the $2K$ remainders $\{\tilde{r}_1^c, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{2K}^c\}$. Hence, (20) is equivalent to (76). If we let $k_0 = K$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{k_0} + D_{k_0+K} &= \tilde{r}_{\varsigma_{(K+1)}}^c - \tilde{r}_{\varsigma_{(K)}}^c + \tilde{r}_{\varsigma_{(1)}}^c - \tilde{r}_{\varsigma_{(2K)}}^c + M \\ &= r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} + M - r_2^c - \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} + r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} - r_1^c - \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} \\ &= \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} + M - \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} - \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\Delta r_{l,k}| < M/8$ for $l = 1, 2$; $k = 1, \ldots, K$, we have

$$D_{k_0} + D_{k_0+K} > M/2.$$

By the definitions of Ω_1 and Ω_2, we obtain from (76) that

$$\Omega_1 = \left\{r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} + M, \ldots, r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} + M\right\}, \quad \Omega_2 = \left\{r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}, \ldots, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}\right\}. \tag{77}$$

Thus,

$$\omega_K - \omega_1 \leq 2\tau, \ \upsilon_K - \upsilon_1 \leq 2\tau.$$

2) $k' \in \{1, \ldots, K-1\}$.

Combining (72) and (73), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &0 \leq r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(k'+1)}} \leq \cdots \leq r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} < r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} \leq \cdots \\ &\leq r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} < r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} + M \leq \cdots \leq r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(k')}} + M < M. \end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

From (63) and (78), we obtain that $\left\{r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} + M, \ldots, r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(k')}} + M, r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(k'+1)}}, \ldots, r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}, \ldots, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}\right\}$ are the $2K$ remainders $\{\tilde{r}_1^c, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{2K}^c\}$. Hence, (20) is equivalent to (78).

If we let $k_0 = K - k'$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{k_0} + D_{k_0+K} &= \tilde{r}^c_{\varsigma_{(K-k'+1)}} - \tilde{r}^c_{\varsigma_{(K-k')}} + \tilde{r}^c_{\varsigma_{(2K-k'+1)}} - \tilde{r}^c_{\varsigma_{(2K-k')}} \\ &= r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} - r_1^c - \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} + r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} + M - r_2^c - \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} \\ &= \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} - \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} - \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} + M \\ &> M/2. \end{aligned}$$

By the definitions of Ω_1 and Ω_2, we obtain from (78) that

$$\Omega_1 = \left\{ r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}, \ldots, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} \right\}, \quad \Omega_2 = \left\{ r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}, \ldots, r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} \right\}. \tag{79}$$

Thus,

$$\omega_K - \omega_1 \leq 2\tau, \ \upsilon_K - \upsilon_1 \leq 2\tau.$$

Subcase 2: $r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(k)}} \geq 0$ and $r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(k)}} < M$ for all $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$.

According to (72), we have

$$0 \leq r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} \leq \cdots \leq r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} < r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} \leq \cdots \leq r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} < M. \tag{80}$$

From (63) and (80), we obtain that $\left\{ r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}, \ldots, r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}, \ldots, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} \right\}$ are the $2K$ remainders $\{\tilde{r}_1^c, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{2K}^c\}$. Hence, (20) is equivalent to (80). If we let $k_0 = K$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{k_0} + D_{k_0+K} &= \tilde{r}^c_{\varsigma_{(K+1)}} - \tilde{r}^c_{\varsigma_{(K)}} + \tilde{r}^c_{\varsigma_{(1)}} - \tilde{r}^c_{\varsigma_{(2K)}} + M \\ &= r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} - r_1^c - \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} + r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} - r_2^c - \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} + M \\ &= \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} - \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} - \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} + M \\ &> M/2. \end{aligned}$$

By the definitions of Ω_1 and Ω_2, we obtain from (80) that

$$\Omega_1 = \left\{ r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}, \ldots, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} \right\}, \quad \Omega_2 = \left\{ r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}, \ldots, r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} \right\}. \tag{81}$$

Thus,

$$\omega_K - \omega_1 \leq 2\tau, \ \upsilon_K - \upsilon_1 \leq 2\tau.$$

Subcase 3: $r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(k)}} \geq M$ for some $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$.

Define $k'' \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ as

$$k'' \triangleq \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} \geq M \\ \min\left\{ k \colon r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(k-1)}} < M, \ r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(k)}} \geq M \right\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

1) $k''=1$.

Combining (72) and (73), we have

$$0\le r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}-M\le\cdots\le r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}-M<r_1^c+\Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}\le\cdots\le r_1^c+\Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}<M. \quad (82)$$

From (63) and (82), we obtain that $\left\{r_1^c+\Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}},\ldots,r_1^c+\Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}},r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}-M,\ldots,r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}-M\right\}$ are the $2K$ remainders $\{\tilde{r}_1^c,\ldots,\tilde{r}_{2K}^c\}$. Hence, (20) is equivalent to (82). If we let $k_0=K$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}D_{k_0}+D_{k_0+K}&=\tilde{r}_{\varsigma(K+1)}^c-\tilde{r}_{\varsigma(K)}^c+\tilde{r}_{\varsigma(1)}^c-\tilde{r}_{\varsigma(2K)}^c+M\\&=r_1^c+\Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}-r_2^c-\Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}+M+r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}-M-r_1^c-\Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}+M\\&=\Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}-\Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}+\Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}-\Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}+M\\&>M/2.\end{aligned}$$

By the definitions of Ω_1 and Ω_2, we obtain from (82) that

$$\Omega_1=\left\{r_1^c+\Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}},\ldots,r_1^c+\Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}\right\},\quad \Omega_2=\left\{r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}-M,\ldots,r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}-M\right\}. \quad (83)$$

Thus,

$$\omega_K-\omega_1\le 2\tau,\ \upsilon_K-\upsilon_1\le 2\tau.$$

2) $k''\in\{2,\ldots,K\}$.

Combining (72) and (73), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&0\le r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(k'')}}-M\le\cdots\le r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}-M<r_1^c+\Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}\le\cdots\\&\le r_1^c+\Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}<r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}\le\cdots\le r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(k''-1)}}<M. \quad (84)\end{aligned}$$

From (63) and (84), we obtain that $\left\{r_1^c+\Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}},\ldots,r_1^c+\Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}},r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}},\ldots,r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(k''-1)}},\right.$ $\left.r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(k'')}}-M,\ldots,r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}-M\right\}$ are the $2K$ remainders $\{\tilde{r}_1^c,\ldots,\tilde{r}_{2K}^c\}$. Hence, (20) is equivalent to (84). If we let $k_0=K-k''+1$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}D_{k_0}+D_{k_0+K}&=\tilde{r}_{\varsigma(K-k''+2)}^c-\tilde{r}_{\varsigma(K-k''+1)}^c+\tilde{r}_{\varsigma(2K-k''+2)}^c-\tilde{r}_{\varsigma(2K-k''+1)}^c\\&=r_1^c+\Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}-r_2^c-\Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}+M+r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}-r_1^c-\Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}\\&=\Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}-\Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}+\Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}-\Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}+M\\&>M/2.\end{aligned}$$

By the definitions of Ω_1 and Ω_2, we obtain from (84) that

$$\Omega_1=\left\{r_1^c+\Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}},\ldots,r_1^c+\Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}\right\},\quad \Omega_2=\left\{r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}-M,\ldots,r_2^c+\Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}-M\right\}. \quad (85)$$

Thus,

$$\omega_K - \omega_1 \leq 2\tau,\ \upsilon_K - \upsilon_1 \leq 2\tau.$$

Next, we prove that k_0 is the only subscript satisfying (23). In fact, for any $k^* \in \{1,\ldots,K\} \setminus \{k_0\}$, we obtain from (22) that

$$D_{k^*} + D_{k^*+K} \leq \sum_{k \neq k_0} \big(D_k + D_{k+K}\big) = M - \big(D_{k_0} + D_{k_0+K}\big) < M/2.$$

This completes the proof. ■

B. Proof of Corollary 2

Proof: As we obtained in Case 2 in the above proof of Lemma 2, the two clusters Ω_1 and Ω_2 are given as

$$\begin{cases} r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} < 0, & \text{see } (77) \\ r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(k)}} < 0 \text{ for some } k \in \{1,\ldots,K-1\}, & \text{see } (79) \\ r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(k)}} \geq 0,\ r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(k)}} < M \text{ for } 1 \leq k \leq K, & \text{see } (81) \\ r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} \geq M, & \text{see } (83) \\ r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(k)}} \geq M \text{ for some } k \in \{2,\ldots,K\}, & \text{see } (85). \end{cases}$$

Since the proofs of the five cases are similar, we only consider the case $r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} < 0$ in the following.

Recall that $\{\Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}},\ldots,\Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}\}$ are sorted in the increasing order from the remainder errors $\{\Delta r_{1,1},\ldots,\Delta r_{1,K}\}$. Hence, for each $\Delta r_{1,k} \in \{\Delta r_{1,1},\ldots,\Delta r_{1,K}\}$, there exists $k_1 \in \{1,\ldots,K\}$ such that

$$\Delta r_{1,k} = \Delta r_{\rho_{(k_1)}}. \tag{86}$$

According to (24) and (77), we have

$$\Omega_1 = \{\omega_1,\ldots,\omega_K\} = \{r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} + M,\ldots,r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} + M\}.$$

Since $\omega_1 \leq \cdots \leq \omega_K$ and $r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} + M \leq \cdots \leq r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} + M$, we have

$$r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(k)}} + M = \omega_k,\ k = 1,\ldots,K. \tag{87}$$

By (86) and (87), we obtain

$$r_1^c + \Delta r_{1,k} + M = r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(k_1)}} + M = \omega_{k_1}.$$

By the definition of circular distance in (27), we obtain

$$d_M(r_1^c + \Delta r_{1,k}, \omega_{k_1}) = 0. \tag{88}$$

By (62), we have

$$d_M(\tilde{r}_{1,k}^c, \omega_{k_1}) = d_M(\tilde{r}_{1,k}, \omega_{k_1}) = d_M(r_1^c + \Delta r_{1,k}, \omega_{k_1}) = 0.$$

Similarly, for each $\Delta r_{2,k} \in \{\Delta r_{2,1}, \ldots, \Delta r_{2,K}\}$, we can prove that there exists $\upsilon_{k_2} \in \Omega_2$, $k_2 \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ satisfying

$$d_M(\tilde{r}_{2,k}^c, \upsilon_{k_2}) = 0.$$

Therefore, (29) holds. ■

C. Proof of Theorem 2

Proof: From (33) and (62), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{q}_{l,k} &= \left[\frac{M q_{l,k} + r_l^c + \Delta r_{l,k} - \overline{\omega}_t}{M}\right] \\ &= q_{l,k} + \left[\frac{r_l^c + \Delta r_{l,k} - \overline{\omega}_t}{M}\right], \end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

where $l = 1, 2; k = 1, \ldots, K$, and t is defined in (34). For convenience, we denote $\overline{\Delta r_l} \triangleq \frac{1}{K}\sum_{k=1}^{K} \Delta r_{l,k}$, $l = 1, 2$. Clearly, $|\overline{\Delta r_l}| \leq \tau$.

Case 1: $0 \leq |d_M(r_1^c, r_2^c)| < M/4$.

As we obtained in Case 1 of Lemma 2, the two clusters Ω_1 and Ω_2 are given as

$$\begin{cases} \ell_{2K} - \ell_1 = 0, & \text{see } (65) \\ \ell_{j+1} - \ell_j = 1 \text{ for some } j < K, & \text{see } (69) \\ \ell_{j+1} - \ell_j = 1 \text{ for some } j \geq K, & \text{see } (70), \end{cases} \tag{90}$$

where ℓ_i are defined in (57). Since the proofs of the three cases are similar, we only prove the case $\ell_{2K} - \ell_1 = 0$.

By (52) and (57), we obtain that $\ell_1 = \cdots = \ell_{2K} = -1$, 0, or 1. Since the proofs of the three cases are similar, we only consider the case $\ell_1 = \cdots = \ell_{2K} = 0$, and c_i are described for the case $3M/4 < r_2^c - r_1^c < M$. According to (65), we have

$$\Omega_1 = \{\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_K\} = \{c_{K+1}, \ldots, c_{2K}\}, \quad \Omega_2 = \{\upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_K\} = \{c_1, \ldots, c_K\}. \tag{91}$$

Since $\omega_i \leq \omega_j$, $\upsilon_i \leq \upsilon_j$, and $c_i \leq c_j$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq K$, we obtain

$$\omega_K - \upsilon_1 = c_{2K} - c_1. \tag{92}$$

Recall that $c_{2K} - c_1 < M/2$ as previously shown in (56). Then, we have $\omega_K - \upsilon_1 < M/2$. According to (31), we have

$$\omega'_k = \omega_k,\ k = 1, \ldots, K. \tag{93}$$

By the definitions of $\overline{\omega}_1$ and $\overline{\omega}_2$ in (32), we obtain

$$\overline{\omega}_1 = \frac{c_{K+1} + \cdots + c_{2K}}{K},\ \overline{\omega}_2 = \frac{c_1 + \cdots + c_K}{K}. \tag{94}$$

According to the definitions of c_i in (52), we have

$$c_1 = \min\{r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} - M\},\ c_{2K} = \max\{r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} - M\}. \tag{95}$$

Then, we have four cases below.

① $c_1 = r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} - M$ and $c_{2K} = r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}$.

Since $c_{2K} = r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}$, we obtain from the definitions of c_i in (52) that $c_{K+1} \geq r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}$. From (94), we have

$$r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} \leq c_{K+1} \leq \overline{\omega}_1 \leq c_{2K} = r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}.$$

Note that $|\Delta r_{l,k}| \leq \tau$ for $l = 1, 2; k = 1, \ldots, K$. Hence, there exists $|\epsilon_1| \leq \tau$ satisfying

$$\overline{\omega}_1 = r_1^c + \epsilon_1. \tag{96}$$

Since $c_1 = r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} - M$, we obtain from the definitions of c_i in (52) that $c_K \leq r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} - M$. From (94), we have

$$r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} - M = c_1 \leq \overline{\omega}_2 \leq c_K \leq r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} - M.$$

Hence, there exists $|\epsilon_2| \leq \tau$ satisfying

$$\overline{\omega}_2 = r_2^c - M + \epsilon_2. \tag{97}$$

② $c_1 = r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}$ and $c_{2K} = r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} - M$.

Similarly, we obtain from (94) that

$$r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} - M \leq c_{K+1} \leq \overline{\omega}_1 \leq c_{2K} = r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} - M,$$

$$r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} = c_1 \leq \overline{\omega}_2 \leq c_K \leq r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}.$$

Hence, there exist $|\epsilon_3| \leq \tau$ and $|\epsilon_4| \leq \tau$ satisfying

$$\overline{\omega}_1 = r_2^c - M + \epsilon_3,\ \overline{\omega}_2 = r_1^c + \epsilon_4. \tag{98}$$

③ $c_1 = r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}$ and $c_{2K} = r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}$.

Similar to ①, we can prove that $\overline{\omega}_1$ is the same as (96).

Note that $3M/4 < r_2^c - r_1^c < M$. Hence,

$$r_2^c - M < r_1^c. \tag{99}$$

Since $c_1 = r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}$, we have $c_K < r_2^c - M + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}$. Otherwise, $c_K \geq r_2^c - M + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}$. Then, we have $c_1 \geq r_2^c - M + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}$, which is a contradiction. By (94), we obtain

$$r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} = c_1 \leq \overline{\omega}_2 \leq c_K < r_2^c - M + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}. \tag{100}$$

Since $|\Delta r_{l,k}| \leq \tau$ for $l = 1, 2; k = 1, \ldots, K$, we obtain from (99) that

$$r_2^c - M - \tau < r_1^c - \tau \leq r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}. \tag{101}$$

Combining (100) and (101), we have

$$r_2^c - M - \tau < \overline{\omega}_2 < r_2^c - M + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}.$$

Hence, there exists $|\epsilon_5| \leq \tau$ satisfying

$$\overline{\omega}_2 = r_2^c - M + \epsilon_5. \tag{102}$$

④ $c_1 = r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} - M$ and $c_{2K} = r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} - M$.

Similar to ①, we can prove that $\overline{\omega}_2$ is the same as (97).

Since $c_{2K} = r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} - M$, we have $c_{K+1} > r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}$. Otherwise, $c_{K+1} \leq r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}$. Then, we have $c_{2K} \leq r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}$, which is a contradiction. By (94), we obtain

$$r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} < c_{K+1} \leq \overline{\omega}_1 \leq c_{2K} = r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} - M. \tag{103}$$

Since $|\Delta r_{l,k}| \leq \tau$ for $l = 1, 2; k = 1, \ldots, K$, we obtain from (99) that

$$r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} - M \leq r_2^c + \tau - M < r_1^c + \tau. \tag{104}$$

Combining (103) and (104), we have

$$r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} < \overline{\omega}_1 < r_1^c + \tau.$$

Hence, there exists $|\epsilon_6| \leq \tau$ satisfying

$$\overline{\omega}_1 = r_1^c + \epsilon_6. \tag{105}$$

Now, we check $\{\hat{q}_{1,k}, \hat{q}_{2,k}\}$, $k = 1, \ldots, K$.

According to (33), either $\overline{\omega}_1$ or $\overline{\omega}_2$ is subtracted from $\tilde{r}_{l,k}$. Note that either $d_M(\tilde{r}^c_{l,k}, \omega_{k_1}) = 0$ or $d_M(\tilde{r}^c_{l,k}, \upsilon_{k_2}) = 0$ holds for some $k_1, k_2 \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$. Hence, we obtain from (89) that $\hat{q}_{l,k}$ is either

$$\hat{q}_{l,k} = q_{l,k} + \left[\frac{r^c_l + \Delta r_{l,k} - \overline{\omega}_1}{M}\right] \text{ or } \hat{q}_{l,k} = q_{l,k} + \left[\frac{r^c_l + \Delta r_{l,k} - \overline{\omega}_2}{M}\right]. \tag{106}$$

When $l = 1$, $\overline{\omega}_1 = r^c_1 + \epsilon_1$ and $\overline{\omega}_2 = r^c_2 - M + \epsilon_2$, we have

$$r^c_1 + \Delta r_{1,k} - \overline{\omega}_1 = \Delta r_{1,k} - \epsilon_1, \quad r^c_1 + \Delta r_{1,k} - \overline{\omega}_2 = r^c_1 + \Delta r_{1,k} - r^c_2 + M - \epsilon_2.$$

Since $3M/4 < r^c_2 - r^c_1 < M$, $|\Delta r_{1,k}| \leq \tau$, and $\tau < M/8$, we obtain

$$-M/4 < \Delta r_{1,k} - \epsilon_1 < M/4, \ -M/4 < r^c_1 + \Delta r_{1,k} - r^c_2 + M - \epsilon_2 < M/2.$$

Hence,

$$\left[\frac{r^c_1 + \Delta r_{1,k} - \overline{\omega}_1}{M}\right] = 0, \ \left[\frac{r^c_1 + \Delta r_{1,k} - \overline{\omega}_2}{M}\right] = 0.$$

It follows from (106) that

$$\hat{q}_{1,k} = q_{1,k}, \ k = 1, \ldots, K. \tag{107}$$

Similarly, for the cases $\overline{\omega}_1 = r^c_2 - M + \epsilon_3$ and $\overline{\omega}_2 = r^c_1 + \epsilon_4$; $\overline{\omega}_1 = r^c_1 + \epsilon_1$ and $\overline{\omega}_2 = r^c_2 - M + \epsilon_5$; $\overline{\omega}_1 = r^c_1 + \epsilon_6$ and $\overline{\omega}_2 = r^c_2 - M + \epsilon_2$, we can also obtain (107).

When $l = 2$, $\overline{\omega}_1 = r^c_1 + \epsilon_1$ and $\overline{\omega}_2 = r^c_2 - M + \epsilon_2$, we have

$$r^c_2 + \Delta r_{2,k} - \overline{\omega}_1 = r^c_2 + \Delta r_{2,k} - r^c_1 - \epsilon_1, \quad r^c_2 + \Delta r_{2,k} - \overline{\omega}_2 = \Delta r_{2,k} + M - \epsilon_2.$$

Note that

$$M/2 < r^c_2 + \Delta r_{2,k} - r^c_1 - \epsilon_1 < 5M/4, \ 3M/4 < \Delta r_{2,k} + M - \epsilon_2 < 5M/4.$$

Then,

$$\left[\frac{r^c_2 + \Delta r_{2,k} - \overline{\omega}_1}{M}\right] = 1, \ \left[\frac{r^c_2 + \Delta r_{2,k} - \overline{\omega}_2}{M}\right] = 1.$$

By (106), we have

$$\hat{q}_{2,k} = q_{2,k} + 1, \ k = 1, \ldots, K. \tag{108}$$

Similarly, for the cases $\overline{\omega}_1 = r^c_2 - M + \epsilon_3$ and $\overline{\omega}_2 = r^c_1 + \epsilon_4$; $\overline{\omega}_1 = r^c_1 + \epsilon_1$ and $\overline{\omega}_2 = r^c_2 - M + \epsilon_5$; $\overline{\omega}_1 = r^c_1 + \epsilon_6$ and $\overline{\omega}_2 = r^c_2 - M + \epsilon_2$, we can also obtain (108).

Therefore, $\{\hat{q}_{1,k}, \hat{q}_{2,k}\} = \{q_{1,k}, q_{2,k} + 1\}$, $k = 1, \ldots, K$. By the generalized CRT for two integers obtained in [13], we have

$$\{\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2\} = \{Q_1, Q_2 + 1\}.$$

Next, we check $\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\}$ for the cases $\hat{Q}_1 = \hat{Q}_2$ and $\hat{Q}_1 \neq \hat{Q}_2$.

1) $\hat{Q}_1 = \hat{Q}_2 = Q_1 = Q_2 + 1$.

We have four cases below.

① $c_1 = r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} - M$ and $c_{2K} = r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}$.

By (36), (96), and (97), we have

$$\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\} = \{N_1 + \epsilon_1, N_2 + \epsilon_2\}.$$

② $c_1 = r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}$ and $c_{2K} = r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} - M$.

By (36) and (98), we have

$$\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\} = \{N_1 + \epsilon_4, N_2 + \epsilon_3\}.$$

③ $c_1 = r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}}$ and $c_{2K} = r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}}$.

By (36), (96), and (102), we have

$$\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\} = \{N_1 + \epsilon_1, N_2 + \epsilon_5\}.$$

④ $c_1 = r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}} - M$ and $c_{2K} = r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}} - M$.

By (36), (97), and (105), we have

$$\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\} = \{N_1 + \epsilon_6, N_2 + \epsilon_2\}.$$

Therefore, (44) holds.

2) $\hat{Q}_1 \neq \hat{Q}_2$.

For simplicity, we suppose that $\hat{q}_{1,k} \neq \hat{q}_{2,k}$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, K$. By (37), (91), and (93), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega' &= \{\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_K, \upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_K\} = \{c_1, \ldots, c_{2K}\} \\ &= \{r_1^c + \Delta r_{1,1}, \ldots, r_1^c + \Delta r_{1,K}, r_2^c + \Delta r_{2,1} - M, \ldots, r_2^c + \Delta r_{2,K} - M\}. \end{aligned}$$

According to (62), we have

$$d_M(\tilde{r}_{1,k}, r_1^c + \Delta r_{1,k}) = 0,\ d_M(\tilde{r}_{2,k}, r_2^c + \Delta r_{2,k} - M) = 0.$$

It follows from (41) that

$$\hat{r}_{1,k}^c = r_1^c + \Delta r_{1,k},\ \hat{r}_{2,k}^c = r_2^c + \Delta r_{2,k} - M.$$

From (42), we obtain

$$\hat{r}_1^c = r_1^c + \overline{\Delta r}_1,\ \hat{r}_2^c = r_2^c - M + \overline{\Delta r}_2.$$

By (43), we have

$$\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\} = \{N_1 + \overline{\Delta r}_1, N_2 + \overline{\Delta r}_2\}.$$

Therefore, (44) holds.

Case 2: $M/4 \leq |d_M(r_1^c, r_2^c)| \leq M/2$.

In this case, all the possible cases of the two clusters, Ω_1 and Ω_2, are described in (86). Since the proofs of the five cases are similar, we only consider the case $r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} < 0$ in the following.

It is noted that the two clusters are given by (77), i.e.,

$$\Omega_1 = \{\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_K\} = \left\{r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(1)}} + M, \ldots, r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} + M\right\},$$

$$\Omega_2 = \{\upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_K\} = \left\{r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}}, \ldots, r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(K)}}\right\}.$$

Since $\omega_K - \upsilon_1 = r_1^c + \Delta r_{\rho_{(K)}} + M - (r_2^c + \Delta r_{\pi_{(1)}})$ and $M/4 \leq r_2^c - r_1^c \leq 3M/4$, we have

$$0 < \omega_K - \upsilon_1 < M. \tag{109}$$

Then, we have two cases: $0 < \omega_K - \upsilon_1 \leq M/2$ and $M/2 < \omega_K - \upsilon_1 < M$. Since the proofs of the two cases are similar, we only consider the case $M/2 < \omega_K - \upsilon_1 < M$. By the definitions of ω_k' in (31), we have

$$\omega_k' = \omega_k - M = r_1^c + \Delta r_{1,k},\ k = 1, \ldots, K. \tag{110}$$

According to the definitions of $\overline{\omega}_1$ and $\overline{\omega}_2$ in (32), we obtain

$$\overline{\omega}_1 = r_1^c + \overline{\Delta r}_1,\ \overline{\omega}_2 = r_2^c + \overline{\Delta r}_2, \tag{111}$$

Now, we check $\{\hat{q}_{1,k}, \hat{q}_{2,k}\}$, $k = 1, \ldots, K$.

According to (33), either $\overline{\omega}_1$ or $\overline{\omega}_2$ is subtracted from $\tilde{r}_{l,k}$. By Corollary 2, we know that (29) holds. Hence, we obtain from (89) that

$$\hat{q}_{1,k} = \left\lceil \frac{\tilde{r}_{1,k} - \overline{\omega}_1}{M} \right\rceil = q_{1,k} + \left\lceil \frac{\Delta r_{1,k} - \overline{\Delta r}_1}{M} \right\rceil = q_{1,k},$$

$$\hat{q}_{2,k} = \left\lceil \frac{\tilde{r}_{2,k} - \overline{\omega}_2}{M} \right\rceil = q_{2,k} + \left\lceil \frac{\Delta r_{2,k} - \overline{\Delta r}_2}{M} \right\rceil = q_{2,k}.$$

Therefore, $\{\hat{q}_{1,k}, \hat{q}_{2,k}\} = \{q_{1,k}, q_{2,k}\}$, $k = 1, \ldots, K$. By the generalized CRT for two integers obtained in [13], we have

$$\{\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2\} = \{Q_1, Q_2\}.$$

Next, we check $\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\}$ for the cases $\hat{Q}_1 = \hat{Q}_2$ and $\hat{Q}_1 \neq \hat{Q}_2$.

1) $\hat{Q}_1 = \hat{Q}_2$.

By (36) and (111), we have $\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\} = \{N_1 + \overline{\Delta r}_1, N_2 + \overline{\Delta r}_2\}$. Hence, (44) holds.

2) $\hat{Q}_1 \neq \hat{Q}_2$.

For simplicity, we suppose that $\hat{q}_{1,k} \neq \hat{q}_{2,k}$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, K$. By (37) and (110), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega' &= \{\omega'_1, \ldots, \omega'_K, \upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_K\} \\ &= \{r_1^c + \Delta r_{1,1}, \ldots, r_1^c + \Delta r_{1,K}, r_2^c + \Delta r_{2,1}, \ldots, r_2^c + \Delta r_{2,K}\}. \end{aligned}$$

According to (62), we have

$$d_M(\tilde{r}_{1,k}, r_1^c + \Delta r_{1,k}) = 0, \ d_M(\tilde{r}_{2,k}, r_2^c + \Delta r_{2,k}) = 0.$$

It follows from (41) that

$$\hat{r}_{1,k}^c = r_1^c + \Delta r_{1,k}, \ \hat{r}_{2,k}^c = r_2^c + \Delta r_{2,k}.$$

According to (42), we obtain

$$\hat{r}_1^c = r_1^c + \overline{\Delta r}_1, \ \hat{r}_2^c = r_2^c + \overline{\Delta r}_2.$$

By (43), we have

$$\{\hat{N}_1, \hat{N}_2\} = \{N_1 + \overline{\Delta r}_1, N_2 + \overline{\Delta r}_2\}.$$

Hence, (44) holds. This completes the proof of the theorem. ■

REFERENCES

[1] J. H. McClellan and C. M. Rader, *Number Theory in Digital Signal Processing,* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1979.

[2] N. Koblitz, *A Course in Number Theory and Cryptography,* Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.

[3] K. H. Rosen, *Elementary Number Theory and Its Applications,* 6th Ed., Addison-Wesley, Mass., 2010.

[4] C. Q. Li, Y. S. Liu, L. Y. Zhang, and K. W. Wong, "Cryptanalyzing a class of image encryption schemes based on Chinese remainder theorem," *Signal Processing: Image Communication,* vol. 29, pp. 914-920, Aug. 2014.

[5] C. Ding, D. Pei, and A. Salomaa, *Chinese Remainder Theorem: Applications in Computing, Coding, Cryptography,* Singapore: World Scientific, 1999.

[6] B. Arazi, "A generalization of the Chinese remainder theorem," *Pac. J. Math.,* vol. 70, pp. 289-296, Jun. 1977.

[7] G. C. Zhou and X.-G. Xia, "Multiple frequency detection in undersampled complex-valued waveforms with close multiple frequecies," *Electron. Lett.,* vol. 33, pp. 1924-1925, Jul. 1997.

[8] X.-G. Xia, "On estimation of multiple frequencies in undersampled complex valued waveforms," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.,* vol. 47, pp. 3417-3419, Dec. 1999.

[9] H. Liao and X.-G. Xia, "A sharpened dynamic range of a generalized Chinese remainder theorem for multiple integers," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory,* vol. 53, pp. 428-433, Jan. 2007.

[10] L. Xiao and X.-G. Xia, "A generalized Chinese remainder theorem for two integers," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 21, pp. 55-59, Jan. 2014.

[11] X.-G. Xia, "An efficient frequency-determination algorithm from multiple undersamppled waveforms," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 7, pp. 34-37, Feb. 2000.

[12] X.-G. Xia and K. Liu, "A generelized Chinese remainder theorem for residue sets with errors and its application in frequency determination from multiple sensor with low sampling rates," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 12, pp. 768-771, Nov. 2005.

[13] W. Wang, X. P. Li, X.-G. Xia, and W. J. Wang, "The largest dynamic range of a generalized Chinese remainder theorem for two integers," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 22, pp. 254-258, Feb. 2015.

[14] X.-G. Xia, "Dynamic range of the detectable parameters for polynomial phase signals using multiple-lag diversities in high-order ambiguity functions," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 47, pp. 1378-1384, May 2001.

[15] Z. H. Yuan, Y. K. Deng, F. Li, R. Wang, G. Liu, and X. L. Han, "Multichannel InSAR DEM reconstruction through improved closed-form robust Chinese remainder theorem," *IEEE Geosci. Remote Sens. Lett.*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 1314-1318, Nov. 2013.

[16] Y. Zhang, W. D. Qi, G. X. Li, and S. Zhang, "Performance of ML range estimator in radio interferometric positioning systems," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 162-166, Feb. 2015.

[17] S. M. Tang, X. Z. Zhang, and D. W. Tu, "Micro-phase measuring profilometry: Its sensitivity analysis and phase unwrapping," *Optics and Lasers in Engineering*, vol. 72, pp. 47-57, Sep. 2015.

[18] A. Akhlaq, R. McKilliam, and R. Subramanian, "Basis construction for range estimation by phase unwrapping," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 2152-2156, Nov. 2015.

[19] K. Falaggis, D. P. Towers, and C. E. Towers, "Method of excess fractions with application to absolute distance metrology: Analytical solution," *Appl. Opt.*, vol. 52, no. 23, pp. 5758-5765, Aug. 2013.

[20] K. Falaggis, D. P. Towers, and C. E. Towers, "Algebraic solution for phase unwrapping problems in multiwavelength interferometry," *Appl. Opt.*, vol. 53, no. 17, pp. 3737-3747, June 2014.

[21] G. Wang, X.-G. Xia, V. C. Chen, and R. L. Fiedler, "Detection, location and imaging of fast moving targets using multifrequency attenna array SAR," *IEEE Trans. Arrosep. Electron Syst.*, vol. 40, pp. 345-355, Jan. 2004.

[22] M. Rüegg, E. Meier, and D. Nüesch, "Capabilities of dual-frequency millimeter wave SAR with monopulse processing for ground moving target indication," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, vol. 45, pp. 539-553, Mar. 2007.

[23] G. Li, J. Xu, Y.-N. Peng, and X.-G. Xia, "Location and imaging of moving targets using non-uniform linear antenna array SAR," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 43, pp. 1214-1220, Jul. 2007.

[24] Y. M. Zhang and M. Amin, "MIMO radar exploiting narrowband frequency-hopping waveforms," in *Proc. 16th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO 2008)*, Lausanne, Switzerland, pp. 25-29, Aug. 2008.

[25] W.-K. Qi, Y.-W. Dang, and W.-D. Yu, "Deblurring velocity ambiguity of distributed space-borne SAR based on Chinese remainder theorem," *J. Electron. Inf. Technol.*, vol. 31, no. 10, pp. 2493-2497, Oct. 2009.

[26] P. Beauseroy and R. Lengellé, "Nonintrusive turbomachine blade vibration measurement system," *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, vol. 21, pp. 1717-1738, May 2007.

[27] S. Chessa and P. Maestrini, "Robust distributed storage of residue encoded data," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory,* vol. 58, no. 12, pp. 7280-7294, Dec. 2012.

[28] W. C. Li, X. Z. Wang, X. M. Wang, and B. Moran, "Distance estimation using wrapped phase measurements in noise," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.,* vol. 61, no. 7, pp. 1676-1688, Apr. 2013.

[29] Z.-X. Huang and Z. Wan, "Range ambiguity resolution in multiple PRF pulse Doppler radars," in *Proc. ICASSP,* pp.1786-1789, Dallas, TX, USA, Apr. 1987.

[30] X.-G. Xia and G. Wang, "Phase unwrapping and a robust Chinese remainder theorem," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.,* vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 247-250, Apr. 2007.

[31] G. Li, J. Xu, Y.-N. Peng, and X.-G. Xia, "An efficient implementation of a robust phase-unwrapping algorithm," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.,* vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 393-396, Jun. 2007.

[32] X. W. Li and X.-G. Xia, "A fast robust Chinese remainder theorem based phase unwrapping algorithm," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.,* vol. 15, pp. 665-668, Oct. 2008.

[33] X. W. Li, H. Liang, and X.-G. Xia, "A Robust Chinese remainder theorem with its applications in frequency estimation from undersampled waveforms," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.,* vol. 57, no. 11, pp. 4314-4322, Nov. 2009.

[34] W. J. Wang and X.-G. Xia, "A closed-form robust Chinese remainder theorem and its performance analysis," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.,* vol. 58, no. 11, pp. 5655-5666, Nov. 2010.

[35] G. W. Xu, "On solving a generalized Chinese remiander theorem in the presence of remainder errors," *arXiv:1409.0121v3,* Aug. 2014.

[36] W. J. Wang, X. P. Li, W. Wang, and X.-G. Xia, "Maximum likelihood estimation based robust Chinese remainder theorem for real numbers and its fast algorithm," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.,* vol. 63, no. 13, pp. 3317-3331, Jul. 2015.

[37] B. Yang, W. J. Wang, Q. Y. Yin, and X.-G. Xia, "Phase detection based range estimation with a dual-band robust Chinese remainder theorem," *Sci. China-Inf. Sci.,* vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 1-9, Feb. 2014.

[38] L. Xiao, X.-G. Xia, and W. J. Wang, "Multi-stage robust Chiense remainder theorem," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.,* vol. 62, no. 18, pp. 4772-4785, Sep. 2014.

[39] C. Wang, Q. Y. Yin, and H. Y. Chen, "Robust Chinese remainder theorem ranging method based on dual-frequency measurements," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.,* vol. 60, no. 8, pp. 4094-4099, Aug. 2011.

[40] O. Ore, "The general Chinese remainder theorem," *Amer. Math. Monthly,* vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 365-370, Jun.-Jul. 1952.